

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicant adds new claims 26-28, and hence claims 1-17 and 19-28 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 6, 7, 16, 17, 19-21, and 23 contain allowable subject matter. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1-5, 8-15, 22, and 24-28 are also patentable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5, 8-10, 12-15, 22, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kavanagh (US Patent 6,809,726) in view of Cok (US Patent 7,106,307). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

A touch screen, which may replace in input device such as a keyboard or mouse, enables a user to touch character or text information displayed on a display device. *See* Specification, ¶ 3. In general, the touch screen has its entire display area set as an active region. *See* Specification, ¶ 4. That is to say, when a user touches any area of the touch screen, the touch screen registers the input and performs an operation consistent with the character or text information displayed at the touched area. However, according to an exemplary embodiment of a touch screen of the present invention, the touch screen does not respond to a touch outside of the set active region. *See* Specification, ¶ 9.

Claims 1, 2, and 8-10

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Kavanagh discloses substantially all the features of claim 1. In particular, the Examiner appears to assert that the acceptable coordinate boundary (18) at column 4, lines 61 to 64 of Kavanagh allegedly teaches the claimed feature of

“an active region.” Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the acceptable coordinate boundary (18) is used to determine whether a touchpoint operation is valid. *See* Office Action, p. 3.

The Examiner also appears to assert that the control logic processor at column 5, lines 9 to 11 of Kavanagh, which executes a re-computation step if a coordinate for a touchpoint is invalid, allegedly teaches the claimed feature of “a control unit for interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active region according to the decision of the decision unit.” Specifically, the Examiner also appears to assert that the rejecting of a touchpoint coordinate at figure 5, step 42 of Kavanagh allegedly teaches this feature. *See* Office Action, p. 4.

However, Kavanagh neither teaches nor suggests “an active region” in combination with the claimed feature of “a control unit for interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active region according to the decision of the decision unit.”

Kavanagh describes that an operator is prompted to touch one or more calibration targets and a control logic processor obtains the coordinates of the actual touchpoint for each calibration target. *See* Kavanagh, col. 4, lines 54-58. If the coordinates are deemed to be within an acceptable boundary, the coordinates are stored in a database. *See* Kavanagh, col. 5, lines 3-6. However, if the coordinates are not within an acceptable coordinate boundary, a default calibration is used. *See* Kavanagh, col. 3, lines 64-65, col. 5, lines 9-15.

Accordingly, Kavanagh neither teaches nor suggests “an active region” in combination with “a control unit for interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active region according to the decision of the decision unit.” Rather, a person

having ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand that the entire touch screen of Kavanagh is active.

Indeed, Kavanagh describes that if the touchpoint coordinates are verified to be within an acceptable coordinate boundary (valid), the control logic processor stores the verified coordinates in a database. *See* Kavanagh, col. 5, lines 3-6. Kavanagh further describes that if the touchpoint coordinates are not verified to be within an acceptable coordinate boundary (invalid), the control logic processor executes a default calibration using coordinate values in the database. *See* Kavanagh, col. 3, lines 64-65, col. 4, lines 18-24. Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art would also understand that the touch screen of Kavanagh responds to an input by the operator when prompted to touch the calibration targets, regardless of whether the touchpoint selected by the operator is within an acceptable coordinate boundary or not.

Accordingly, Kavanagh neither teaches nor suggests “an active region” in combination with “a control unit for interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active region according to the decision of the decision unit,” since Kavanagh discloses nothing about interrupting a response to a touch input if the coordinate values are outside an acceptable coordinate boundary. Rather, as discussed above, Kavanagh describes a response by the control logic processor, which is a default calibration, to any touch input if the coordinate values are outside an acceptable coordinate boundary.

As a result, Kavanagh fails to teach “an active region” in combination with “a control unit for interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active region according to the decision of the decision unit.” Cok fails to cure the deficient

disclosure of Kavanagh, and hence the combination of Kavanagh and Cok would not have rendered claim 1 unpatentable.

Moreover, the Examiner also concedes that Kavanagh fails to teach the claimed feature of “wherein the active region comprises a region having coordinate values of four edges of an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces, and a region having coordinate values of four edges of a status bar.” However, the Examiner asserts that since an acceptable coordinate boundary (18) may take other shapes, such as a square, the Examiner concludes that such a feature would have been obvious. *See* Office Action, p. 4.

However, as discussed above, Kavanagh neither teaches nor suggests the claimed “active region.” Further, regardless of whether the acceptable coordinate boundary of Kavanagh may take any shape, the entire display of Kavanagh remains active.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that the acceptable coordinate boundary of Kavanagh allegedly teaches the claimed “plurality of interfaces.” *See* Office Action, p. 3. Kavanagh describes that an operator is promoted to touch one or more calibration targets. *See* Kavanagh, col. 3, lines 47-56, col. 4, lines 54-56. A calibration point defines an acceptable coordinate boundary about the target. *See* Kavanagh, col. 5, lines 8-12. As shown in figures 2 and 3 of Kavanagh, the calibration point is within the calibration target and acceptable coordinate boundary.

However, Kavanagh neither teaches nor suggests “wherein the active region comprises a region having coordinate values of four edges of an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces, and a region having coordinate values of four edges of a status bar.” Rather, the Examiner has not cited any portion of Kavanagh for teaching a second region corresponding to

the claimed “status bar,” most likely since Kavanagh fails to teach such a feature. At best, as discussed above, Kavanagh merely describes a plurality of calibration targets having associated calibration points and an acceptable coordinate boundaries. However, Kavanagh neither teaches nor suggests “the active region comprises...an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces, and a...status bar,” since Kavanagh discloses no areas other than the acceptable coordinate boundaries.

As a result, Kavanagh also fails to teach the claimed feature of “wherein the active region comprises a region having coordinate values of four edges of an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces, and a region having coordinate values of four edges of a status bar.” Cok also fails to cure this deficient disclosure of Kavanagh, and hence the combination of Kavanagh and Cok would not have rendered claim 1 unpatentable for at least these additional reasons.

Claims 2 and 8-10 depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1, and hence claims 2 and 8-10 should be deemed patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 5, 12-15, 22, and 25

Independent claim 5 recites the features of “deciding whether the first coordinate values exist in an active region of an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces” and “interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active regions as a result of the decision, wherein the active region comprises a region having coordinate values of four edges of a status bar.”

Therefore, since claim 5 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding independent claim 1, the combination of Kavanagh and Cok would not have rendered claim 5 unpatentable for at least analogous reasons.

Moreover, claim 25 depends on claim 5 and incorporates all the features of claim 5. As a result, claim 25 includes “wherein the active region comprises a region having coordinate values of four edges of a status bar” and “wherein the active region further comprises a region having coordinate values of four edges of an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces.”

Therefore, since claim 25 also recites features similar to those discussed above regarding independent claim 1, the combination of Kavanagh and Cok would not have rendered claim 25 unpatentable for at least analogous reasons.

Claim 24

Independent claim 24 recites the features of “deciding whether the first coordinate values exist in an active region of an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces” and “interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active regions as a result of the decision.”

Therefore, since claim 24 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding independent claim 1, the combination of Kavanagh and Cok would not have rendered claim 24 unpatentable for at least analogous reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 7, 16, 17, 19-21, and 23 are allowable and claims 3, 4, and 11 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into

independent form. Applicant respectfully holds the rewriting of claims 3, 4, and 11 in abeyance until the arguments with respect to claim 1 are considered.

New Claims

As discussed above, Applicant adds new claims 26-28. Applicant respectfully submits new claims 26-28 should be deemed patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Applicant also respectfully submits the references cited by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest all the features of claims 26-28.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 23, 2008

S. Stuart Lee
Registration No. 61,124